

# A Note on a Consistency Property for Permutations

Citation for published version (APA):

Derks, J., & Peters, H. J. M. (2002). A Note on a Consistency Property for Permutations. *Discrete Mathematics*, 250, 241-244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(01\)00346-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(01)00346-6)

**Document status and date:**

Published: 01/01/2002

**DOI:**

[10.1016/S0012-365X\(01\)00346-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(01)00346-6)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Please check the document version of this publication:**

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

[www.umlib.nl/taverne-license](http://www.umlib.nl/taverne-license)

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

[repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.



# ARTICLE IN PRESS



ELSEVIER

Discrete Mathematics ■■■ (■■■■) ■■■-■■■

DISCRETE  
MATHEMATICS

www.elsevier.com/locate/disc

Note

## A note on a consistency property for permutations

Jean Derks<sup>a,\*</sup>, Hans Peters<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics, University of Maastricht, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht,  
The Netherlands*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Economics, University of Maastricht, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht,  
The Netherlands*

Received 14 January 1999; received in revised form 3 April 2001; accepted 30 April 2001

### Abstract

In cooperative game theory allocation of earnings to players may take place on the basis of selectors or—more restrictively—consistent selectors, or on the basis of a permutation representing the queueing of the players. This note gives a graph theoretic characterization of those situations in which the latter allocation method results in allocation with consistent selectors.  
© 2002 Published by Elsevier Science B.V.

**Keywords:** Selector; Permutation; Consistency; Cycle

### 1. Introduction

For a finite set  $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$  we consider functions, the so-called selectors, assigning to each non-empty subset of  $N$  an element of that subset; formally, a *selector* is a function  $\alpha: 2^N \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow N$  with  $\alpha(S) \in S$  for every non-empty subset  $S$  of  $N$ .

In [2] the notion of selector is introduced in a game theoretic context, where the elements of  $N$  are the players, and a non-empty subset  $S$  of  $N$  is a coalition. In this context, a selector assigns a representative to each coalition. We will adopt the notation and terminology from the game theoretic literature since the problem that we tackle in this note is inspired by an application in this field.

A selector  $\alpha$  is called *consistent* if the representative of any coalition  $S$  is also the representative of the subsets of  $S$  containing that representative; i.e., if  $S, T \subseteq N$ , and  $T \subseteq S$  so that  $\alpha(S) \in T$ , then  $\alpha(T) = \alpha(S)$ .

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: jean.derks@math.unimaas.nl (J. Derks), h.peters@ke.unimaas.nl (H. Peters).

A selector is mainly used in allocation methods of the total earnings among the players. Assuming that these earnings (e.g., the so-called dividends of a cooperative game) are split up over the coalitions, allocation is simply performed by giving the earnings of each coalition to its representative. If the average is taken over all selectors or over all consistent selectors, this allocation method results in the well-known Shapley Value (cf. [3,1]).

A different approach towards allocation is the assignment of the earnings according to a specified queueing  $\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(n)$  of the players, as follows: allocate to player  $\pi(j)$  all positive earnings of those coalitions  $S$  with no member to the left of  $\pi(j)$  (so,  $\pi(j)$  is the first of the players in  $S$ ), and all negative earnings of those coalitions  $S$  with only players to the left of  $\pi(j)$  (i.e.,  $\pi(j)$  is the last player in  $S$ ). In other words, if we let the players take their turn from right to left then each player, when it is his turn, may grab all positive earnings of coalitions containing him and not already taken, and he may pass on the negative earnings of coalitions as long as there are still players waiting in that coalition; if not he has to accept also these earnings. Allocations based on this method are called *greedy* for obvious reasons, and considered first in [1]; there it is shown that taking the average of all greedy allocations (one for each permutation  $\pi$ ) again results in the Shapley value.

It is not hard to see that the greedy allocations correspond to allocations based on specific selectors. Moreover, in [1] it is shown that the convex hull of all greedy allocations is equal to the convex hull of all allocations based on arbitrary selectors, the so-called selectope. Also, the question is raised to characterize those situations where all greedy allocations correspond to consistent selectors. Because allocations based on consistent selectors are exactly the marginal values (cf. [4]) this question concerns the coincidence of the Weber set (i.e., the convex hull of the marginal values) and the selectope. The purpose of the present note is to give a (hyper)graph theoretic characterization of this coincidence.

## 2. The characterization result

For a permutation  $\pi$  denote the player in coalition  $S$  who has no predecessors in  $S$  by  $\min_{\pi}(S)$  and denote the player in  $S$  for whom all other players in  $S$  are predecessors by  $\max_{\pi}(S)$ . Let  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  denote two disjoint subsets of coalitions. In the game theoretic context the elements of  $\mathcal{R}$  are those coalitions with negative earnings, and  $\mathcal{L}$  those with positive earnings.

We say that a selector  $\alpha$  is an  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -match for permutation  $\pi$  if

$$\alpha(S) = \max_{\pi}(S) \quad \text{for all } S \text{ with } S \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (1)$$

$$\alpha(S) = \min_{\pi}(S) \quad \text{for all } S \text{ with } S \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (2)$$

Observe that the representatives of the coalitions in  $\mathcal{R}$  according to  $\alpha$  are the Right-most players according to  $\pi$ , and the representatives of the coalitions in  $\mathcal{L}$  according to  $\alpha$  are the Left-most players according to  $\pi$ . Further, observe that an allocation on

the basis of an  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -match yields the same outcome as the greedy allocation method based on queueing according to  $\pi$ .

A reformulation of the question at the end of the Introduction is: For which pairs  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$  do all permutations have consistent  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -matches?

Let  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  be disjoint sets of coalitions. A sequence  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k$  of  $k$  different coalitions from  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{L}$  is called an  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle if there are  $k$  different players  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  such that

- (i) for each  $r = 1, \dots, k$ , it holds that  $i_r \in S_r \cap S_{r+1}$  (where  $S_{k+1}$  denotes the coalition  $S_1$ );
- (ii) at least one coalition is taken from  $\mathcal{R}$  and at least one from  $\mathcal{L}$ .

$(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle free collections are exactly those pairs that we are looking for:

**Theorem.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  be disjoint collections of coalitions. The following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *There exists no  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle.*
- (b) *For each permutation  $\pi$  of  $N$  there exists a consistent  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -match.*

**Proof.** For the implication (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a), suppose there exists an  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k$ . Since each  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle contains two consecutive coalitions, one in  $\mathcal{L}$  and one in  $\mathcal{R}$ , we may assume without loss of generality that  $S_1 \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $S_k \in \mathcal{R}$ . Choose different players  $i_r$  in the intersection of  $S_r$  and  $S_{r+1}$ , for every  $r = 1, \dots, k$ . One may also assume  $i_r \notin S_\ell$  for all  $r = 1, \dots, k$  and  $\ell \neq r, r+1$  because otherwise at least one of the two shorter cycles  $S_\ell, S_{\ell+1}, \dots, S_r$  and  $S_\ell, S_r, S_{r+1}, \dots, S_{\ell-1}$  is again an  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle, so that the proof can be restarted with the appropriate shorter cycle.

With these players  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  define the following mapping  $\pi$ :

$$\pi(i_r) = \begin{cases} |\{j: j \geq r \text{ and } S_j \in \mathcal{L}\}| & \text{if } S_r \in \mathcal{L}, \\ n - |\{j: j > r \text{ and } S_j \in \mathcal{R}\}| & \text{if } S_r \in \mathcal{R}. \end{cases}$$

Observe first that  $\pi(i_r) \in N$  for all  $i_r$  because an  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle contains at most  $n$  coalitions. Let  $L$  denote  $|\{j: j \in \mathcal{L}\}|$ , and  $R$  denote  $|\{j: j \in \mathcal{R}\}|$ . With these notations we have  $\pi(i_r) \leq L$  whenever  $S_r \in \mathcal{L}$ , and  $\pi(i_r) > n - R$  whenever  $S_r \in \mathcal{R}$ . Further,  $\pi(i_r) \neq \pi(i_\ell)$  whenever  $S_r, S_\ell \in \mathcal{L}$  or  $S_r, S_\ell \in \mathcal{R}$ , so that  $\pi$  is injective. By extending  $\pi$  to  $N$  and by taking the positions of the other players arbitrarily among the remaining positions  $L+1, \dots, n-R$ , we obtain a permutation.

We will now show that the permutation  $\pi$  has the property  $i_r = \min_\pi(S_r)$  for all  $S_r \in \mathcal{L}$ . For  $S_r \in \mathcal{L}$  there are only two players among  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  who are member of  $S_r$ , namely  $i_{r-1}$  and  $i_r$  (where the index 0 is taken to mean  $k$ ). If  $S_{r-1} \in \mathcal{L}$  then  $\pi(i_{r-1}) = \pi(i_r) + 1$ , and if  $S_{r-1} \in \mathcal{R}$  then  $\pi(i_{r-1}) > n - R \geq L \geq \pi(i_r)$ . Therefore,  $\pi(i_{r-1}) > \pi(i_r)$ . The other players of  $S_r$  obtain positions between  $L+1$  and  $n-R$ , so that we must have  $i_r = \min_\pi(S_r)$ .

The property  $i_r = \max_\pi(S_r)$  for all  $S_r \in \mathcal{R}$  can be shown similarly.

Now suppose that there exists a consistent selector  $\alpha$  satisfying (1) and (2). So, by construction of  $\pi$  we have  $\alpha(S_r) = i_r$  for each  $r = 1, \dots, k$ . Consider the coalition

1  $S = \bigcup_{r=1}^k S_r$ . Then  $\alpha(S)$  is a member of one of the coalitions  $S_1, \dots, S_k$ , say  $S_r$ . Consistency thus implies that  $\alpha(S) = i_r$ ; therefore,  $\alpha(S) \in S_{r+1}$ , so that, again by consistency,  
 3  $\alpha(S) = i_{r+1}$ , a contradiction. This proves the implication (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a).

In order to prove the implication (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b), suppose there are no  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycles. Let  
 5  $\pi$  be an arbitrary permutation of the player set. Consider the directed graph  $(N, E)$  on  $N$  with edge set  $E$  equal to the union of the sets  $\{(\max_{\pi}(S), j) : j \in S, S \in \mathcal{R}\}$ , and  
 7  $\{(\min_{\pi}(S), j) : j \in S, S \in \mathcal{L}\}$ .

Suppose there exists a directed cycle in this graph, say  $i_1, \dots, i_k$ . Then consider  
 9 for each edge  $(i_r, i_{r+1})$  in this cycle a coalition  $S_r \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{L}$  such that  $i_r, i_{r+1} \in S_r$ , and  $i_r = \max_{\pi}(S_r)$  if  $S_r \in \mathcal{R}$  or  $i_r = \min_{\pi}(S_r)$  if  $S_r \in \mathcal{L}$ . It is impossible that all these  
 11 coalitions can be chosen from  $\mathcal{R}$ , because otherwise  $\pi(i_1) > \pi(i_2) > \dots > \pi(i_k) > \pi(i_1)$ . Similarly, not all these coalitions can be chosen from  $\mathcal{L}$ . This implies that  $S_1, \dots, S_k$   
 13 is an  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle, a contradiction. Hence, there are no directed cycles in  $(N, E)$ . Therefore, there is a permutation  $j_1, \dots, j_n$ , with the property that each edge  $(j_l, j_r)$  in  
 15  $E$  satisfies  $l > r$ . Consider the following selector  $\alpha$  which chooses for each coalition  $S$  the right-most player:

17 
$$\alpha(S) = j_r \quad \text{with } r = \max\{l : j_l \in S\}, \quad S \subseteq N.$$

This  $\alpha$  is consistent. Now let  $S \in \mathcal{R}$ , and suppose that  $\alpha(S) \neq \max_{\pi}(S)$ . This implies  
 19  $(j_l, j_r) \in E$  for  $\max_{\pi}(S) = j_l$  and  $\alpha(S) = j_r$ , and, therefore,  $l > r$ ; but this contradicts the definition of  $\alpha$ . Therefore,  $\alpha$  satisfies (1). Similarly one shows that  $\alpha$  satisfies (2).

21 This concludes the proof of the Theorem.  $\square$

Clearly, no  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycles exist if the carriers of both collections have at most one  
 23 player in common, that is,  $|(\bigcup\{S : S \in \mathcal{R}\}) \cap (\bigcup\{S : S \in \mathcal{L}\})| \leq 1$ .

There is no clear intuition of the existence or non-existence of a  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ -cycle in the  
 25 game theoretic context although the very appealing implication of the non-existence is that the set of selector-based allocations coincides with its subset of allocations coming  
 27 from consistent selectors. For a detailed discussion the reader is referred to [1].

## References

- 29 [1] J. Derks, H. Haller, H. Peters, The Selectope for cooperative games, *Internat. J. Game Theory* 29 (2000) 23–38.  
 31 [2] P.L. Hammer, U.N. Peled, S. Sorensen, Pseudo-Boolean functions and game theory. I. Core elements and Shapley value, *Cahiers du CERO* 19 (1977) 159–176.  
 33 [3] L.S. Shapley, A value for  $n$ -person games, in: A.W. Tucker, H.W. Kuhn (Eds.), *Contributions to the Theory of Games II*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1953, pp. 307–317.  
 35 [4] R.J. Weber, Probabilistic values for games, in: A.E. Roth (Ed.), *The Shapley Value: Essays in Honor of L.S. Shapley*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988, pp. 101–119.